

Half a Sheet of Mr Humfrey's, in Pursuance of PACIFICATION.

THERE is a Book of Mr Williams's, call'd, *Gospel Truth Stated*, from whence Occasion hath been taken for Division. It is a good Book, a useful Book, especially for young Ministers, and such of the People, who being a little Learned, or Bookish, turn Disputative, to save them from Error. I do therefore thank him for it, and especially for what he hath said on *Phil. 2.* and that he hath abided by it. It is what I said in my Sheet of *Justification* in the first Edition, so many Years agoe, and Sir Charles Wolesley after me. I have read his Book over and over, and considering the multitude of matters, with common Allowance to Human Frailty, I can find few Faults in comparison, and should have found none had I not already, unless this be one. That he hath got so many Hands to it; or, which is worse, that when his Book was sufficient for its own defence, he should, upon the writing of one against it, go to vindicate it. If he had not wrote again, he had then overcome; but is overcome now if he don't. In this Book there are two Expressions which the Brethren would have him retract: One is, *There is not a Change of Person between Christ and the Elect.* The other is, *The Father was never displeased with Christ.* I will humbly motion here a drawn Battel, or mutual Condescension; that is, for Mr Williams to withdraw one of these Passages they except against; and, for the Brethren to withdraw the other Exception.

As for the first Passage, whatsoever is to be understood by *Commutation of Persons*, the Brethren understand thus much, That Christ put on the Person of Sinners, for these are their Words. Now Mr Williams, I suppose, denies this, and they would have him retract his Denial. By *Person* therefore we are to consider, that two things may be signified, the Person of the Sinner himself, *Suppositum rationale*; or the *Quality or Condition* of a Sinner, as, when a Man acts a Drunkard on the Stage, he personates Drunkenness, if a King, he personates Majesty. Christ, GOD-Man, stood in the room of us Sinners, in what he did and suffer'd for us, *quatenus* He and we are *Supposita rationalia*, and in this first sence of the word Mr Williams allows a *Commutation of Persons*, so as when the Suffering was Christ's, the Benefit was Ours, which is that *Grotius* intends only against the *Socinians*. But Mr Williams denies that Christ took upon him the *Quality or Condition* of Sinners; that is, in the second sence of the word, he denies what they affirm, to wit, That He put on the Person of Sinners. Christ did not represent or act the part of Sinners, nor was look'd on by God as a Sinner, when our Surety: A *commutatio Hominum* there was, no *commutatio Actuum*. He represented Us that are Sinners, he represented not the Sinner. A Sinner is one that breaks the Law of God, and Christ did not so, he acted no such Part, and God never accounted that he did; and there is therefore no change of * *Person*, though a change of *Persons*, according to Mr. Williams. When in this sence therefore of the word *Person* he is in the right, let us consider further as to the other sence of it, (as it signifies our Human Nature, not our Sinful Nature, or Sinful Qualities) that tho' Christ did sustain our Persons (giving the Brethren liberty of such words) as to what he did and suffer'd in our stead, yet is there nothing wherein we reciprocally sustain his Person, as he did ours; nothing that we are to be said or accounted to have done what he did; and therefore do I in my late Book, *Pacification*, say, That here is only a change of *Person*, but not of *Persons*. A strange thing really, that when the same sence is intended by me and Mr Williams, the same Distinction used, and both say true, yet the Terms of that Distinction are contrarily apply'd by us. I must desire Mr Williams therefore to consider, whether his use of the word *Person* be not † Foreign to our Divines, and it were not better to put what he means in such Terms as are easier of reception, and that may be only by distinguishing of Christ's taking on him our Persons, or bearing our Sins; in regard to the Fault, or the Punishment; and to say, he sustained not our Persons, or took on him our Sins *quoad reatum culpa* (in these known words) so as to be accounted of God a Sinner; but *quoad reatum poena propter culpam nostram*, so only as voluntarily oblig'd to our Punishment. Here is the same thing in sence, and if so good an end as Re-union might be obtained by it, he may (understanding with me) retract the words in his Book [*There is not a change of Person*] and grant a change of *Person*, so long as he maintains still with me no change of *Persons*, for his business is done thereby as well as by his sticking to a Word. The Lord Jesus, in what he did and suffer'd for us, sustained our Persons, (I give way to such Phrases for Peace) inasmuch as we still say, That what he did and suffer'd for us was accounted by God as done and suffer'd in our room, that we might have the benefit of it; but not accounted by him as if we had done and suffer'd in Christ's Person what he did and suffer'd for us; and so, in that respect, is there a change of *Person*, but not of *Persons*; whereby I mean plainly, not such a change as to make Christ's Righteousness Legally or in Law-sence Ours (or to be imputed *in se*, for that; let Mr Williams know, is all one), which whoever affirms (without Shifts), let him be as great in our esteem as he will, I say, he speaks it in Ignorance hitherto of what this draws after it, To wit, that (besides the Consequences I shew, *Pacif. p. 36.*) he makes us to be justified by Christ's Righteousness, *per modum causae formalis*, which is an unadvised, absurd, and dangerous Position, as that *apostolus* Jesus of our former great Divines, which gave the rise to *Antinomianism*. Be it known therefore to the deservedly-beloved Dr. Bates, and the deservedly-envied Mr. Williams, (for there must be

* The distinction of these terms is not made ordinarily by Divines. (which excuses the Brethren's Citation of one for the other) but I use it as peculiar for explaining Mr Williams's Sence: if any shall still chuse to confound them, and express our Sence otherwise, it is all one to me, and may be to him.

† As they speak of Christ's judicially sustaining our Person, for in this second sence of the word Person, (or Mr Williams's sence) Christ acted no Person but the Person of a Mediator.

some-

¶ Justification
nis formam
justitia con-
stare certum
est: A Middle
Way therefore
here, between
Presbyterian and
Papist, defile-
deter.

something overtopping others in the man, which is envied, and the worthy Brethren thence drew, or signed this Paper, that here is the Point which (I believe) they have not bent the Minds to search into, so far as to be willing to speak out, and tell me if I ask, When Faith which is our Evangelical Personal Righteousness, does concur some way with the Righteousness of Christ to our Justification, and Christ's Righteousness (we know) does concur *sub genere causæ* *Efficientis procatolica* (and *Materialis* also with Mr Baxter) *per modum Meriti*, and no otherwise: What is then, let any one of them tell me, *What* wherein the formal Cause or Reason of Justification is to be placed, or can Justification be, or consist, without *Any*

For this Advice now, which, according to my Natural Genius, I should have given Mr Williams, (See 1 Pet. iii. 15.) I apprehended not prejudicial to Gospel Truth, if his sense is upheld, that is the Truth of his Book, while the Quarrel about a Word be composed. It is plain, that Mr. Williams, and I, and They, hold the same thing; for he is no Socinian, but holds, Christ died for us in the Sense of in our stead; That he was our *ἀντιτύπον*, importing a Surrogation of Christ's Person in our room, when he became a Sacrifice for us, which is as much (I say again) as *Grotius*, to whom they appeal, did intend. It is nothing therefore, in my esteem, for Mr. Williams to withdraw an Expression in that sense which offends, seeing in the *Antinomian* sense, wherein he denies a change of Person, the Brethren agree in the Negative with him; and in the *Orthodox* sense, which they own, Mr. Williams agrees in the Affirmative with them. It is not base here, but generous, and to be Victor to give way, it being enough that they both have declared themselves. Besides, if the Brethren be earnest to search into the matter, and would order their words so as we might come to Concord both in Words and Sense, I have chalked out here, from my late Book, this Accommodation: I will allow them a change of Person in the Orthodox sense of the word, so as to grant Christ did sustain our Person in what he did and suffer'd; And they shall allow to me, that there is not a change of Persons, so, as God did look on us to have done in Christ's Person what he did, tho' he did it in our behalf; and they shall henceforth frame their Words accordingly. And that our Brethren may bend to some Reconciliation in this Proposal, I do find, since I wrote my *Pacification*, the same Conception in Dr Owen. We do not say, that God judgeth or esteemeth that we did and suffer'd in our Persons what Christ did and suffer'd; but only that he did it and suffer'd it in our stead. Of Justif. p. 295.

As for the latter Passage, That the Father was never displeased with Christ; thus much must be premised and understood from what is said on the former; That in the sense he sustains our Persons he was made Sin for us, as the Apostle speaks, tho' he knew no Sin, that is to be understood *Effective*. He was not made Sin or a Sinner *formaliter*, but I say *effective*, in regard to the Effect of Sin, that is the bearing our Punishment, as before. Our Saviour therefore may be consider'd as bearing our Persons (according to these Brethren) and so our Sin, or in his own Person. God could not be displeased with him in the one, no, nor in the other Consideration, because it was of his own appointment. God, in the Punishment on his Son (not of his Son) was displeased with the Sin and Sinners whose Person he bare, but he was never displeased with the Person of his Son, and much less now, when he was fulfilling the Command of his Father, in giving himself for us an Offering, and Sacrifice of a sweet-smelling Savour unto him. He must have a witty Invention, I think, that can find any thing to make himself differ from Mr. Williams in this Point. And what, when they and he agree in Sense, would our Brethren have Mr. Williams retract these Words? Nay, it is I they must withdraw here, Or they may bid him next go contradict the Voice of God from Heaven, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

There is one thing yet I cannot but take notice of, that in their late written Paper, unto which I have alluded all this while, as likewise in their printed Agreement (1692) our Brethren do declare their Approbation of the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, the Assembly's Confession of Faith, and that at the Savoy, as the Rule of their Preaching, so as to be liable to Rebuke if they preach otherwise; which whether they understand disjunctively or conjunctively, (as in the Paper, or in that Agreement) it being more than any Authority call'd them to, I would have them lay it to Heart, and think, Whether if this Imposition which they have imposed on themselves were imposed on them by the Bishops, they would not some of them stick at it? For my part, I declare, that a Subscription to the 36 Doctrinal Articles, without liberty of Explication, is the hardest part of Conformity; and if there should be a Comprehension with this Injunction, I should repent I had sought it. But as for our selves, why any one that can chuse, should bind himself up to any Rule of his Preaching but the Bible, I see no reason, and must propose rather to our Brethren on both sides, That seeing their Union is broken at present, they begin a new one, not in drawing certain *Theses* in such a Latitude of Words, which All may subscribe, this being no Union when the Tongue is only One, and the Mind *diven*, (as I have formerly express'd myself) but in forbearing and bearing with one-another as to all things but what is of necessity to Salvation. *In necessariis Unitas, in non necessariis Libertas.* This I shall inculcate while I am

John Humfrey.

¶ This Half-sheet is taken out of half a dozen Sheets I have writ since my Book of Pacification, wherein I have something more to say, in regard to my Middle Way, than I had. A Book will not be bought nor read, when a Paper will. At this Conjunction this Paper I think more needful; It may set some Thoughts to work in the Peaceable, and shall have such Effect as God gives it. In my Pacification I pray the Reader that bath it, to mend a Fault of the Printer, and to insert the word [Not] p. 35. l. 20.